**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY**

–

**DATED: 13-09-2005**

–

**WRIT PETITION No.20155 OF 2005**

Between:

V.Venkata Rattaiah . . .Petitioner

And

The Govt. of A.P. and others . . .Respondents

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY**

–

–

**WRIT PETITION No.20155 OF 2005**

**O R D E R:**

The petitioner was initially appointed as Typist in Sri Malleswara Swamy Temple, Peda Kakani, Guntur, on contract basis with effect from 19-03-1999. He submitted a representation for regularization of his services. The temple authorities submitted proposals on 08-12-2004 to the Commissioner of Endowments, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, the second respondent. Through his proceedings dated 14-04-2005, the second respondent accorded permission for regularization of services of the petitioner in the post of Typist-cum-Clerk. The orders of the Commissioner were implemented by the temple authorities through their orders dated
14-04-2005.

In the recent past, the Government of Andhra Pradesh took note of the large-scale irregularities committed by the Commissioner, who incidentally accorded permission for regularization of services of the petitioner. Several orders were passed either keeping the orders passed by such Commissioner in abeyance or cancelling them. Consequently, the Assistant Commissioner and Executive Officer of the temple passed orders dated 15-08-2005 setting aside the orders dated 14-04-2005 regularising the services of the petitioner in the post of Typist-cum-Clerk. The same is challenged in this writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Pleader for Endowments and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the third respondent.

Identical question fell for consideration before this Court in a batch of writ petitions i.e. WP.Nos.19107 of 2005 and batch. After taking into account the relevant provisions of the Act and the factual aspects of the matter, this Court disposed of the said batch of writ petitions through common order dated 09-09-2005 with certain directions. The present case stands on the same footing.

Following the said common order, this writ petition is disposed of directing that,

a) the first respondent shall issue notice to the petitioner pointing out the nature of irregularities said to have been committed by him and the action it proposes to take against the petitioner in the matter of regularizing his services in the post of Typist-cum-Clerk.

b) on consideration of the representation and the material on record, the first respondent shall pass appropriate orders within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Till such time, the petitioner shall continue to function as Typist on contract basis and in case, the Government drops its action, the petitioner shall have the benefit of regularization of services in the post of Typist-cum-Clerk. If the first respondent fails to pass orders as directed above, the petitioner shall continue to avail the benefit of regularization of services without prejudice to the right of the Government to take further action thereafter.

_____

(L.NARASIMHA REDDY, J)

13th SEPTEMBER, 2005.

***kvni***